arXiv:hep-th/0201072v1 11 Jan 2002

LPTENS-02/02, PAR-LPTHE 02-01

Flat connections from flat gerbes

Arjan Keurentjes[1] [2]

[1] Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de l'École Normale Supérieure
24, rue Lhomond
75230 Paris Cedex 05, France
[2] Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et des Hautes Energies
Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris VI) 4, place Jussieu
75252 Paris Cedex 05, France
e-mail arjan.keurentjes@lpt.ens.fr

Abstract: We discuss some aspects of heterotic-Type I duality. We focus on toroidal compactification, with special attention for the topology of the gauge group, and the topology of the bundle. We review the arguments leading to a classification of $Spin(32)/Z_2$-bundles over tori, suitable for string compactifications. A central role is played by n-gerbes with connection, a generalization of bundles with connection.

1 Introduction

One of the most remarkable string-dualities that has been proposed in the past decade is the conjectured S-duality between the heterotic $Spin(32)/Z_2$ string and the type I string. In spite of the agreement of the massless spectrum and the low energy effective action, there are so many differences in the formulation of the two theories that a duality relation may seem rather implausible at first sight. Nevertheless, the duality has passed so many detailed tests that it seems likely that the 2 perturbative theories indeed are different limits of a single underlying theory.

This brief review mainly focusses on the work reported in [14]. We will discuss aspects of the duality that will be relevant for compactification of the 2 theories. The duality does not depend on the compactification manifold, and we will restict to toroidal compactification, although our techniques should be applicable to more complicated situations.

2 Toroidal compactification

Both theories have a Yang-Mills sector, and one should choose an appropriate bundle over the k-torus T^k one compactifies on. To ensure that the string equations of motion are obeyed, we require that this bundle is flat.

Next we should specify the structure group of the bundle. The type I string theory has open strings with Chan-Paton factors taking 32 values, with manifest gauge symmetry (the adjoint representation of) $O(32)$. The construction of the heterotic string (in its bosonic

formulation) involves a self-dual 16 dimensional Euclidean lattice, fixing the topology of the gauge group to $Spin(32)/Z_2$. This paradox was resolved in [17, 19]: The type I theory has an instanton breaking $O(32)$ to its connected component $SO(32)$, while a solitonic particle transforms in the spinor representation of $Spin(32)$. Hence these non-perturbative states fix the structure group to $Spin(32)/Z_2$.

A flat $Spin(32)/Z_2$-bundle on a k-torus is completely characterized by k commuting holonomies $\Omega_i \in Spin(32)/Z_2$ $(i = 1, \ldots, k)$ for k independent 1-cycles of the torus. There are many distinct possibilities. Some examples:

- Pick all Ω_i in an Abelian subgroup of $Spin(32)$. This is always allowed, and results in the "standard" and Narain compactification schemes.
- Let Ω_i be commuting elements of $Spin(32)/Z_2$ that do not commute when lifted to $Spin(32)$. This is "absence of vector structure": States in the vector representation **32** (which is absent) would make such compactifications inconsistent [2, 3, 16, 18].
- Choose Ω_1 such that it has a centralizer with non-simply connected semi-simple part G. Then choose two (or more) remaining holonomies such that they commute in G, but their lifts to the simply connected cover $\tilde{G}$ of G do not [5, 10, 11, 18].
- Non-trivial triples, quadruples, quintuples of holonomies with and without vector structure [4, 5, 10, 11].

There is yet another complication: In string theory not even all $Spin(32)/Z_2$ bundles are allowed! This can be seen in the following ways.

One of the results of [5] is that flat principal bundles over the 3-torus are characterized by 2 pieces of information. First, there is the topology of the bundle. Restricting to bundles compatible with the group $Spin(32)/Z_2$, the topology can be specified by a "generalized Stiefel-Whitney class" [18]. Second, there is the Chern-Simons invariant

$$\frac{1}{16\pi^2 h}\int_{T^3}(A\mathrm{d}A + \frac{2}{3}A^3) \tag{1}$$

As shown in [5], this invariant takes typically rational (and not necessarily integer!) values. But in string theory one has the anomaly-relation

$$H = \mathrm{d}B + CS(A) - CS(\omega) \tag{2}$$

relating the field strength for the NS 2–form to the Chern-Simons forms of the gauge connection A and the spin connection ω. On the k-torus, we set $\omega = 0$, but a non-trivial Chern-Simons form for the gauge connection seems incompatible with vanishing of H [4].

In the heterotic theory, there is a nice microscopic explanation for this anomaly. In Narain compactification, the momenta take the form:

$$k^I = q^I + w_i a_i^I \tag{3}$$

$$k_{iL,R} = \frac{n_i - q^I a_i^I - w_j a_i^I a_j^I/2}{R} \pm \frac{w_i R}{2} \tag{4}$$

For winding states (non-zero w_i), the representation vector k^I picks up contributions from the Wilson line a_i^I, resulting in representations that would not be present in a (particle) gauge theory. It is precisely these representations that pick up phases related to the Chern-Simons invariant, and turn the compactification into an inconsistent one [4].

3 T-duality to type II orientifolds

Compactifying type I theory on a k-torus, and applying T-dualities in all directions, one arrives at a type II theory on an orientifold T^k/Z_2 where the Z_2 acts as reflection on all coordinates of the k-torus (the action on the string states can be found in the references). The resulting configurations of D-branes and orientifold planes provide a geometrical description of the moduli space of flat connections. This can be done for any compactification with an $O(32)$ bundle [12], but for bundles that cannot be lifted to $Spin(32)/Z_2$, and those with fractional Chern-Simons invariants (defined over sub-3-tori), we should expect inconsistencies.

A cohomology analysis suggests the existence of the following orientifold planes (see [1, 7] and references therein).

Op plane	group	R_{p+1}	$\mathcal{B}$	$\mathcal{C}$
Op^-	$O(2n)$	-2^{p-4}	0	0
Op^+	$Sp(n)$	$+2^{p-4}$	1	0
$\widetilde{\text{O}p^-}$	$O(2n+1)$	$1-2^{p-4}$	0	1
$\widetilde{\text{O}p^+}$	$Sp(n)$	$+2^{p-4}$	1	1

(5)

Here R_{p+1} stands for Dp-brane charge, and $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are discrete Z_2 fluxes, from the NS 2–form and the RR $(5-p)$–form. The latter can only be defined when $p \leq 5$, and we will henceforth assume that planes with non-trivial $\mathcal{C}$ charge do not exist for $p > 5$ (see [1, 9] for a different conclusion).

The first consistency requirement is then: Only use orientifold planes that exist. This eliminates many of the inconsistent bundles. For example, $\widetilde{\text{O}8^-}$ planes would occur in the dual to compactification on a circle with a holonomy in $O(32)$ with determinant -1, but neither the bundle, nor $\widetilde{\text{O}8^-}$ planes are consistent in string theory.

A second consistency requirement is based on the observation that the orientifold planes emit discrete NS– and RR–fluxes. Consistency requires us to patch these fluxes together in such a way that the resulting configuration obeys the equations of motion. Again, the easiest way to achieve this (while preserving supersymmetry), is to require vanishing field strengths. In technical terms, the discrete tensorfluxes should give rise to flat n-gerbes, away from the orientifold planes.

4 The holonomy of flat n-gerbes

The concept of a bundle can be generalized to that of an n-gerbe. As a matter of fact, 0-gerbes are just unitary line bundles [8]. We take the point of view of [8], and define a gerbe on a manifold in terms of transition functions over overlapping patches, satisfying suitable cocycle conditions.

A connection on an n-gerbe is an $(n+1)$-form C_{n+1}. Its gauge transformation is

$$C_{n+1} \sim C_{n+1} + \mathrm{d}C_n \tag{6}$$

This is important when gluing the patches together: connections on different patches may differ by a gauge transformation. The C_n themselves are only defined up to an exact form;

$$C_n \sim C_n + \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{n-1} \tag{7}$$

One may view the C_n as connections on an $(n-1)$-gerbe, defined over the overlap patches. Their gauge invariance becomes important on *triple* overlaps. Consistency requires that

on such triple overlaps the n–forms of the double overlaps sum to an exact form, say $\mathrm{d}C_{n-1}$. The C_{n-1} have their own gauge invariance, and can therefore be viewed as connections on $(n-2)$ gerbes, defined over the triple overlaps. The argument repeats until one reaches the zero forms, which form the transition functions for 0-gerbes (that is, line bundles).

We specify the connection on the n-gerbe, by the tower of $(n+1)$–forms on patches, n–forms on overlaps, $(n-1)$–forms on triple overlaps, etc. We require the gerbe to be flat, but as with bundles, this doesn't mean the gerbe is trivial; there may be non-trivial holonomy around closed $(n+1)$–cycles, and hence we should compute it. For a bundle we would integrate over patches, and correct for the transitionfunctions on the overlap patches. The generalization of this procedure reads as follows[4, 15]

$$\int_M C = \sum_i \int_{M_i} C_i - \sum_{ij} \int_{M_{ij}} C_{ij} + \sum_{ijk} \int_{M_{ijk}} C_{ijk} - \dots . \tag{8}$$

In words: "Cut up" the manifold M in pieces (by a partition of unity) and integrate the $(n+1)$-forms C_i, defined on the patches M_i. On the boundaries M_{ij} connecting the patches M_i and M_j there is a gauge transformation, specified by the form C_{ij}. Integrate all the C_{ij}'s over the M_{ij}. On the triple boundaries M_{ijk} connecting M_i, M_j and M_k the form C_{ijk} specifies the connecting gauge transformation, Integrate all C_{ijk} over the M_{ijk}, etc. In the end, combine all the partial results in an alternating sum. The first term in eq. 8 can be viewed as a "bulk" contribution, the second is a correction due to the overlap patches, the third a correction due triple overlaps, etc.

Equation 8 is invariant (for M without boundary) under the gauge transformations

$$\begin{aligned} C_i &\rightarrow C_i + dL_i \\ C_{ij} &\rightarrow C_{ij} + L_i + L_j + dL_{ij} \\ C_{ijk} &\rightarrow C_{ijk} + L_{ij} + L_{jk} + L_{ki} + dL_{ijk}, \text{ etc.} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

5 A classification of orientifolds

We now return to our problem. The Z_2 action on the orientifold T^k/Z_2 gives rise to 2^k $\mathrm{O}(9-k)$ planes. The identities of these planes are specified by two discrete fluxes $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. The question is which configurations of planes give rise to flat gerbes. For convenience we put coordinates on the k-torus with period 2. The fixed points of Z_2 have coordinates that are either 0 or 1, and the $O(9-k)$-planes can be viewed as elements of $(Z_2)^k$.

Consider first the $\mathcal{B}$ flux. This gives rise to a 1-gerbe (or gerbe for short). The holonomy formula eq. 8 has 3 terms. Focus on any of the $\mathrm{O}(9-k)$ planes, with coordinates p_i, and compute (for a generic flat gerbe) the holonomy around this plane. The result is [14]

$$\mathcal{B}(\{p_i\}) \equiv \int_{M_p} B = \sum_{i<j} b_{ij} p_i p_j + \sum_i b_i p_i + b. \tag{10}$$

The three terms in this result come from the separate terms in eq. 8. The b_{ij}, b_i and b are Z_2 coefficients, antisymmetric in their indices, that specify the flat gerbe. All multiplications and sums on the r.h.s of this equation are within the field Z_2, and hence $\mathcal{B}$ is also an element of Z_2. Eq. 10 computes whether a given $\mathrm{O}(9-k)$ plane carries a $\mathcal{B}$ flux, and therefore partly specifies the identity of the plane.

The formula for the RR $(k-4)$–form depends on the value of k. The result (see [14]) is similar to that for $\mathcal{B}$: A flat $(k-3)$-gerbe over T^k/Z_2 is specified by finitely many coefficients, that specify the $\mathcal{C}$ flux of each $\mathrm{O}(9-k)$ plane.

By letting b_{ij}, b_i, b, and the coefficients for the RR $(k-3)$–gerbe, take all possible Z_2 values, one finds all configurations of orientifold planes giving rise to flat gerbes. This is more than we want. There are coordinate transformations in

$$(Z_2)^k \times SL(k, Z_2), \tag{11}$$

that map T^k/Z_2 to itself, but permute the orientifold planes. We are only interested in different configurations modulo these coordinate changes. Using the transformations to restrict the polynomial eq. 10 and its RR-counterpart to suitably chosen standard forms, the redundancy is eliminated.

Having specified the gerbes, we indirectly have specified the identities of all the orientifold planes. These contribute to the RR-tadpole, which has to be canceled by adding either D-branes, or anti D-branes. We will demand unbroken supersymmetry (which is necessary if the configuration is T-dual to a toroidal compactification of the type I string with flat bundle) and hence a tadpole that can be canceled by adding D-branes.

The rest of the classification program consists of straightforward but tedious computations, for which we refer the reader to [14]. The detailed results can also be found there. The following table gives a summary of some results.

k	$r=16$	$r=8$	$r=4$	$r=2$	$r=0$	total
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	0	0	1	2
2	1	1	0	0	1	3
3	1	1	0	0	2	4
4	1	2	1	1	2	7
5	1	2	2	1	7	13
6	1	3	4	6	21	35

(12)

The first column specifies the number k in T^k/Z_2. The next columns specify, for a given value of k how many distinct (up to coordinate transformations) configurations of orientifold planes exist on T^k/Z_2, such that the resulting theory is supersymmetric, with manifest[1] gauge group of rank r. The last column gives the total of different models that were identified. Problems in finding a standard form for the 3-form have prevented us from going beyond $k=6$ (but see [14] for some isolated results).

A point which should be stressed, is that the classification of [14] is *not* a classification of components in the moduli space of string theories with 16 supersymmetries. There are components in this moduli space that do not allow an orientifold description, while other components have more than one orientifold description (see e.g. [4]).

We motivated this work by referring to type I-heterotic duality. However, not all models we found are T-dual to a type I compactification on a k-torus with a flat bundle. A second class of models that enters our classification is dual to compactifications of the "shift orientifold" of IIB theory. Compactifying the IIB theory on a circle, one can combine the orientifold projection with a shift over the circle [6, 18], leaving 16 supersymmetries unbroken. This construction also has a gauge theory interpretation [12, 13].

In 4-dimensions, we find $N=4$ supersymmetric gauge theories and $SL(2,Z)$-duality. Only $SL(2,Z_2)$, which is isomorphic to the permutation group on 3 elements, is manifest in our set-up. All theories organize in orbits under the $SL(2,Z_2)$. None of these orbits has the maximal length (6), most have length 3. There are 2 orientifold configurations

[1] We are ignoring the gauge bosons resulting from Kaluza-Klein reduction on metric and forms.

that are singlets under $SL(2,Z_2)$, one corresponding to the standard compactification, and one non-trivial one with rank 4 gauge group.

A possible criticism on this work could be that it ignores the modern opinion that K-theory, rather than cohomology is the appropriate formalism for RR-fluxes, also in an orientifold set-up [1]. A number of facts (K-theory gives the same results for isolated planes [1], many of our models have known heterotic duals [4, 13], invalidating a single theory would render the $SL(2,Z)$ orbits of 4-d S-duality incomplete) give us confidence that a honest K-theory classification would not differ much from ours. Our classification may be a suitable starting point for research in this direction.

Acknowledgments: I enjoyed discussing with Jan de Boer, Robbert Dijkgraaf, Eric Gimon, Amihay Hanany, Bernard Julia and Jussi Kalkkinen. Niels Keurentjes has helped me with a computer program used for this research. This work is partly supported by EU contract HPRN-CT-2000-00122.

References

[1] O. Bergman, E. G. Gimon and S. Sugimoto, JHEP**0105**, 047 (2001) [hep-th/0103183].

[2] M. Bianchi, G. Pradisi and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **376** 365 (1992).

[3] M. Bianchi, Nucl. Phys. B **528** 73 (1998) [hep-th/9711201].

[4] J. de Boer, R. Dijkgraaf, K. Hori, A. Keurentjes, J. Morgan, D. R. Morrison and S. Sethi, hep-th/0103170.

[5] A. Borel, R. Friedman and J. W. Morgan, math.gr/9907007.

[6] A. Dabholkar and J. Park, Nucl. Phys. B **477** 701 (1996) [hep-th/9604178].

[7] A. Hanany and B. Kol, JHEP**0006**, 013 (2000) [hep-th/0003025].

[8] N. Hitchin, math.dg/9907034.

[9] Y.Hyakutake, Y.Imamura and S.Sugimoto, JHEP**0008**, 043 (2000) [hep-th/0007012].

[10] V. G. Kac and A. V. Smilga, hep-th/9902029.

[11] A. Keurentjes, JHEP**9905**, 001 (1999) [hep-th/9901154]; A. Keurentjes, JHEP**9905**, 014 (1999) [hep-th/9902186]; J.A.H. Keurentjes, Ph.D. thesis (Leiden University), June 2000, hep-th/0007196.

[12] A. Keurentjes, Nucl. Phys. B **589** 440 (2000) [hep-th/0004073].

[13] A. Keurentjes, Phys. Rev. D **65** 026007 (2002) [hep-th/0105101].

[14] A. Keurentjes, JHEP**0107** (2001) 010 [hep-th/0106267].

[15] M. Mackaay and R. Picken, math.dg/0007053.

[16] A. Sen and S. Sethi, Nucl. Phys. B **499** 45 (1997) [hep-th/9703157].

[17] A. Sen, JHEP**9809** 023 (1998) [hep-th/9808141]; A. Sen, JHEP**9810** 021 (1998) [hep-th/9809111].

[18] E. Witten, JHEP**9802** 006 (1998) [hep-th/9712028].

[19] E. Witten, JHEP**9812** 019 (1998) [hep-th/9810188].